Human Events *A Weekly Analysis for the American Citizen*
Combined with the Magazine ANALYSIS
Editorial Office 1710 Rhode Island Ave., N. W., WASHINGTON 6, D. C. *Telephone* NATIONAL 2066

VOL. VIII, NO. 52, *Issue Number* 413, DECEMBER 26, 1951 ★ *Editor:* FRANK C. HANIGHEN ★ *Associate Editor:* FRANK CHODOROV

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA RECEIVED JAN 8 '52 LIBRARY

THE PRESIDENCY

By Edna Lonigan

During the coming months there will be much debate over who should be elected to the Presidency. Whether the office, in its present form, should be filled at all is the far more important question.

The American Presidency, as now constituted, bears only superficial resemblance to the office of chief executive envisioned in the Constitution. This fact is often conceded, but the change is usually described in the vague terms of size or function. However, such generalizations will not do, for the present Presidency differs from its predecessor in essential structure. It is "architecturally" different. To describe the new Presidency, one must look to history for analogy.

After the break-up of Europe, following the religious wars, the nation-states that arose took one of two forms. In one, characteristic of the Continent, centralization was achieved by the strong arm of an absolute prince. In the other, of which the prime example is England, the local communities were merged into a national unity under a council or parliament, which ruled by the consent of the component parts.

The mechanism by which the strong princes maintained and enhanced their power over local rivals was a bureaucracy, consisting of devoted personal followers. The model for the bureaucracy was the army. It was a corps of civil servants, operating as a unit under a chain of command in response to a single will. Like an army, its total force could be turned in whatever direction the rulers ordered. While the military applied force to compel compliance, the bureaucracy concentrated on finding new taxes, new sources of revenue and new ways of spending it, all to enhance the glory and the power of the ruler they served.

As the personnel of this staff increased, the power of the chieftain expanded. As his power expanded, that of the local communities declined; leaders who might have resisted a personal chieftain were unable to cope with this multiplication of personal power through a bureaucratic army. Local autonomy, the chrysalis in which individual liberty takes form, diminished. In the glitter of the kingship, in the chance for advancement of the few who served the great one, the intellectuals and the en-

Copyright 1951 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

trepreneurs lost sight of the fact that centralization destroys all liberty. In country after country, the rising business classes sold out, for a temporary advantage or a mess of glamor, to some upstart king.

The British resisted. A strong sense of personal liberty, coupled with a tradition of local liberty, frustrated King John's attempt to imitate the Continental form, and found expression in the immortal words of the Magna Carta. When Charles I tried to enlarge the kingship through a personal bureaucracy, he also met up with this resistance. And to safeguard themselves against further efforts at encroachment, the English set up a protective Parliament, a policy-making body consisting of local representatives. They bolstered it with a Bill of Rights, and gave it the real substance of political power -- control over the public purse.

II

The American Constitution was drawn up by men well versed in the history of European political institutions, and aware of the dangers of a standing army of bureaucrats. Therefore, they gave the newly established Congress the two necessary safeguards of representative government -- power to make specific allotments of money to the Executive and power to define, and therefore limit, the precise shape and function of every agency that was part of the Executive establishment.

Thus, the American Presidency was the chief executive over a group of services, each of which worked under limited powers and with well-defined duties, clearly spelled out by Congress in advance, and changeable only by Congress in the public gaze. Bureaus and departments were creations of Congress, not the Executive. They were delimited in scope by statute law, and subject to the further grinding process of annual appropriations doled out by Congress. Government employees served the nation, not the chief of state.

The heads of Cabinet departments were drawn from private -- not governmental -- life. Usually, they had had successful business or professional careers, to which they expected to return at the end of their service. They were fellow-members of the President's party, as a matter of course, but they retained a measure of independence and personal dignity; they were not his personal servitors. Under the circumstances, the Cabinet developed a loyalty to the nation, not the Executive, and in its discussion of foreign and domestic policy this loyalty was paramount.

There was no need for "unification" of the War and Navy Departments, nor were we plagued with jurisdictional disputes between State and War, because unity was arrived at by the open discussion of peers, all primarily interested in the welfare of the country. It was limited government

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

through simple, statutory agencies; it bore a resemblance to the American village community, where each family and enterprise carried on its work unhindered, but achieved a common purpose through an effective habit of voluntary cooperation.

III

President Franklin D. Roosevelt abolished this Cabinet system in his first few weeks of office. He converted the American Presidency into the model of the Chief of State, like that of Louis XIV, Frederick of Prussia or Peter the Great. The first step in the process of reorientation was a request to Congress for a lump-sum appropriation, to be used by the President at his discretion. The request was made and granted under cover of an "emergency".

At the time, it seemed a necessary and harmless step to take, but the political effect of this blank-check grant was to put into the hands of the Executive a "machine tool" with which he could reshape the old-line agencies into instruments subservient to his will. Congress lost its power to limit their activities and control their power. The lump-sum agencies no longer were beholden to the representatives of the people, the watch-dog of the public purse, but to the President who could now furnish them with funds. The fortunes of the men who manned these agencies were dependent on his will, not the law.

The principle of lump-sum appropriations having been established, the habit grew. And with it came, as a matter of course, a number of secret fluctuating cabals, each intent on enhancing its powers by insinuating itself into the good graces of the President. Rendering service to the country was not their concern. Internecine rivalries developed.

The work of integrating policy, formerly confined to the legally-controlled Cabinet departments, fell to, or was appropriated by, these uncontrolled insiders. Thus, the Presidency became a heterogeneous machine, the visible head of it losing importance in its management. It could be managed by an inner circle even if the President were a wholly incompetent man, or a dying one.

The power of the central government grew. Not only were private individuals or corporate groups unable to stand up to it, but the integrity of state and local governments was undermined. With the transfer of economic power from Congress to the President, the servants of the palace became the supreme rulers of the land.

The sight of an army of Federal workers descending on every village and city in the country, building fortresses in the local squares, with the intent of intimidating the citizenry, would horrify Americans. They

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would be shocked to learn of an even stronger Bastille erected in Washington. But, politically, that is what has occurred.

IV

The American Presidency with its invisible rulers is now the omnipotent government. It can influence the selection of candidates of both parties, control the organization of almost every Congressional district, drive its ablest critics from public office, subsidize and intimidate a large part of the public press -- and hire a crew of experts in brainwashing to erase the vestiges of liberty in our minds.

It makes no difference who is called Mr. President if this Frankenstein is permitted to live in our midst. Like the present incumbent, whoever is elected will not be permitted to know what is going on. The real power will be in the hands of the most ruthless and unscrupulous of the insiders, and ultimate victory will go to the most unscrupulous of all, those who take their strategy and tactics from Moscow.

The only way, then, to defend the country against internal and external dangers is to tear down the Bastille of the new Presidency. And only Congress can do that.

The paramount issue before the country is sovereignty. The new Presidency has vitiated the concept of individual sovereignty upon which the structure of our country was built. It is the supreme power. To restore the balance in government by which the liberties of the people were secured, it is necessary for Congress to regain its control over the means by which this monster Presidency rules -- the people's money.

So far, the coalition in Congress of men in both parties who hold for personal and local liberty has been negative, defensive. That kind of fighting ends in broken hearts, early deaths. To successfully attack the new Leviathan, its purpose must be recognized and met head-on. And that purpose is simply to destroy all the institutions of a free society.

The pattern of autocracy is always the same. It is always in the name of national defense that autocrats have asked for new grants of power and wealth. Hence, the supreme test of those who would defend liberty is the capacity to delimit the powers of the central government when the urge for centralization is greatest -- in wartime. What powers does it really need, what requests for power can be safely rejected, and what guarantees for the relinquishment of wartime powers must be demanded?

The future of America is in the hands of Congress. It alone can restore to us the local and individual liberties that have made our country great. If it will do this, it will take its place in history with the Stuart Parliaments which, by defying the "wave of the future", saved liberty for three hundred years.

Quotation up to a paragraph is permitted with credit to HUMAN EVENTS. For reproduction or more extensive quotation address requests to HUMAN EVENTS, 1710 Rhode Island Avenue, N. W., Washington 6, D. C. Trial subscription, three months for $3. Six months, $5.50. One year, $10. Two years, $18. Domestic airmail (including APO and FPO) one year, $12.00; foreign (regular mail) one year, $11. Foreign airmail rates on request. Please remit in U.S.A. DOLLARS. Allow two weeks for new subscriptions or change of address to become effective.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Not Merely Gossip *A Supplement to* Human Events Vol. VIII, No. 52

By Frank C. Hanighen December 26, 1951

INSIDE THE JAPANESE PEACE TREATY: During this holiday time, State Department officials have been studying one of the most important pieces of business which the Senate will have to tackle when it reconvenes January 8: the Japanese Peace Treaty.

Liaison men of the State Department have been on Capitol Hill sampling the opinions of Senators as they visit their offices after vacations and trips. It is believed that the Treaty will command a majority and perhaps the Opposition will number no more than twenty. But State has some apprehensions about amendments. This is the reason.

It has come to light in the past forty-eight hours that the Civil Rights Congress, a Communist front organization, has filed with the UN a charge that the United States is guilty of "genocide" because of treatment of the American negro minority of 15 million. But how is this connected with the Japanese Peace Treaty?

For some time, the UN human rights covenant, specifying "genocide" and racial prejudice, has been one of the pieces of business that the Senate has failed to confirm. But, now, through the Japanese Peace Treaty, a "back door" has been created by which the human rights covenant may be effectively recognized, and made the law of the land. (In that case, Communist charges like those of the Civil Right Congress will be prosecuted against Americans via the UN.)

Largely due to the alert exposure of the Chicago Tribune, this business of human rights and genocide has been shown to be integrally connected with the Japanese Peace Treaty. Now it becomes clear that the famous Japanese Peace Treaty, put over in the show at San Francisco last fall, has been used as a vehicle for what the Tribune calls a "sneak attack on the Constitution".

John Foster Dulles managed to slip into the preamble of the treaty a statement that Japan shall be required "to strive to realize the objectives of the universal declaration of human rights".

What does this really mean? "What Dulles is attempting to do", says the Tribune, "is to get the Senate on record, through ratification of the Japanese Peace Treaty, as approving the principles enunciated in the declaration and covenant of human rights. That is, he is trying to put something over by indirection, when he knows that this same thing, taken up on its own merits and entirely apart from the peace treaty, would stand no chance of being endorsed."

(The reader should be reminded that largely by the efforts of the American Bar Association, through its former President, Frank Holman, the Senate has been warned of the danger that the human rights covenant will supercede our own Bill of Rights.)

In view of these emerging facts, there is no wonder that State Department liaison men with the Senate fear "crippling amendments". For such Senators as Jenner, McCarran and Malone who have underlined the dangers of the treaty will hardly forbear from commenting on this "sneak attack on the Constitution".

* * * * *

SCANDALS AND SCANDALS: Whatever the eventual political results of the exposés of corruption may be, the White House is very worried. Its occupants are described as desperately "flailing around" for a solution. Thus, the idea of picking Judge Murphy as the "broom" originated not in the Palace Guard, but with an anti-Truman Southern Democrat whose opinion was asked by a White House aide. Clutching at a "last straw"?

Copyright 1951 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The President -- we learn -- was "boiling mad" when Judge Murphy finally turned down the offer.

---- A new cause of worry in the Palace Guard arises from much private talk about a close relative of a controversial Cabinet member. This relative has been trying to sell his "influence". But nothing may come of this, for the man involved is believed to have promised more than he delivered or could deliver.

---- Secretary of the Treasury Snyder's high reputation has suffered -- and unjustly. In the St. Louis case, he withheld action at request of President Truman. But Fair Deal columnists (who dislike the conservative Snyder) have succeeded in obscuring this fact. Actually, Snyder is honest, lives very modestly, accepts no favors and has no private fortune.

* * * * *

THE ISSUE OF CORRUPTION: The new big question of public debate is -- as usual -- "loaded" on the Administration side. Thus, it is widely asked, "Can the Administration ride safely through such an exposure of its corruptions?" But few ask the really crucial question: "Does Big Government breed corruption?"

Many Republicans and conservative Democrats fall into the trap, wasting much time arguing the first question, instead of the second. The "juicy details" of the revelations absorb the critics of the Administration so exclusively that they seem to be saying, "but we can do it honestly". This, in the decalogue of Republican principles must be rated as the blackest of all sins -- me-tooism.

There may, also, be a whopping misunderstanding of how the public views the current exposure of corruption. We learn that some researchers who have studied the mail arriving in offices of members of Congress say that the protests "from home" stand in this order: (1) Taxes; (2) Korea; (3) Corruption.

It should not impose too heavy a strain on the intellects of Republican leaders to perceive that No. 3 proceeds from Nos. 1 and 2 -- and to go on from there.

Since too many of the Opposition leaders have their eyes fixed on the main chance, they might mull over, more carefully than they have so far, the potential effects of the corruption issue on the voters in '52. One GOP politico from the key state of New York has remarked to us that the cry of corruption would not turn that state to the Republican banner next year. He says there are just too many Democrats -- after twenty years -- who wouldn't vote GOP under any circumstances; and that there aren't sufficient dyed-in-the-wood Republicans in New York. He may be wrong. But we can well imagine that in 1952, Democratic demagogy might make once more the spectre of unemployment sufficiently vivid -- to urban voters -- to cause them to forget the antics of Mr. Caudle.

* * * * *

COLLAPSIBLE SPIES: Like distant thunder, rumors of an approaching exposé of our psychological warfare activities have been circulating on Capitol Hill. Senators, Congressmen and members of their staffs who have been journeying abroad are drifting back here with annoying stories of the bumbling of our official propaganda "experts" and some harrowing tales of imbecilic, tragic mistakes.

For instance, in the past twenty-four hours, we heard one such story brought back by an official who ought to know what he is talking about and who has no reason other than public service to spread it. He referred to the recent story broadcast by Tass, the Soviet news agency. Tass claimed that two Russian expatriates "trained in West Germany by U.S. Intelligence agents", had been parachuted into Southwest Russia. These men were captured -- Tass asserted -- and executed by Soviet authorities. The State Department promptly described this Tass story as "fantastic".

Our informant on Capitol Hill doesn't think of it as quite that fantastic. He claims that the Tass version is approximately correct and that two such "expatriates"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

were captured and probably suffered the supreme penalty -- but not through any very brilliant police work by the Soviets. They were spotted and apprehended, he says, because our "cloak and dagger" boys had equipped them on this parachute mission with collapsible bicycles. These "experts" who planned the mission had been so entranced with a gadget, a collapsible bike, that they ignored an important fact: bicycles in Soviet Russia, especially in rural Southwest Russia, are about as rare and conspicuous as a horse on the streets of Washington. It is hardly surprising, then, that the unfortunate parachutists were picked up. Nor is it surprising that such stories are building up a storm on Capitol Hill.

* * * * *

PRESS FREEDOM: Mr. Walter Trohan's description of the press situation in Washington (HUMAN EVENTS, December 5, 1951) has drawn praise from various independent members of the old, if not oldest, profession. One worrking journalist phoned us to offer his congratulations and to add to our store of knowledge of the subject. "Just yesterday", he said, "a State Department functionary advised me that I should 'try to get in on' the Secretary's very exclusive, off-the-record luncheons. I politely declined. I've heard a lot about those affairs, and absorbed some knowledge of how State Department officials try to kill news. At those 'exclusive' affairs, you get no 'exclusive' news, or if you do, it's under pledge of secrecy. They try to 'sew you up'. Yet, there are a lot of the boys who consider it a high favor to be invited to these 'intimate luncheons'."

Another man, a former European journalist of great distinction, commented: "The fact is that Washington journalism has become very similar to that practiced in Eastern European countries -- in Poland, Lithuania, Hungary, Roumania -- where I served in the Thirties. Those countries were classified then as semi-dictatorships. However, in most of them an Opposition press was tolerated, and there were few moves to close up such papers.

"But, the Governments did control the journalists indirectly, much as Trohan describes the situation in Washington. It had its subtle 'pay-off' and held a club over journalists who sought to rebel against Government control. A competitor would be favored; or various privileges of the journalist would be hampered or cut off; or he would not be included in the next junket to Paris or London. Etc., Etc. In short, it did not pay a journalist to be independent or non-conformist. It looks like this Government here in Washington -- which would resent the classification of 'semi-dictatorship' -- is successful in controlling the press by the same means as in pre-war Eastern Europe."

* * * * *

A HISTORY OF MANKIND: An unkind memory was stirred up by the announcement that UNESCO is sponsoring the writing "by 1000 scholars" of a History of Mankind, in six volumes and 3,000,000 words. The announcement recalled George Orwell's Nineteen Eighty-Four, in which it is told how the ruling regime regularly rewrote history to suit its purposes. This was an unkind thought, for these thousand scholars may do a fine job of objective history writing. But, one cannot help wondering whether a scholar who is solidly convinced that all history is the recording of the workings of "dialectic materialism" can really evaluate events by any other yardstick. Since a great many of our scholars are so convinced, is it not likely that one of them will, quite honestly, explain David's affair with Bathsheba along economic lines? Then, again, when the scholar comes to the American Revolution how will he treat the doctrine of "natural rights"? Most scholars these days treat the doctrine as a myth -- in a class with the Santa Claus story. If the scholar doing the chapter on the American Revolution is of that conviction, it would be difficult for him to do otherwise than describe Madison, Jefferson and Co. rather condescendingly: naive though noble, unrealistic visionaries.

One of the purposes of this collosal job is the "shaping of a common outlook upon the development of mankind". Whose outlook will be common?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Book Events

The Fear of Freedom, by Francis Biddle. Introduction by Harold L. Ickes. New York: Doubleday and Co. $3.50. Reviewed by Frank Chodorov.

Mr. Francis Biddle, who served as Attorney General under Franklin D. Roosevelt, and is currently Chairman of Americans for Democratic Action, has written a book. What the book is about can be gleaned from the opening sentences of the blurb on the jacket:

> "For more than a decade a wave of hysteria has infected the people of the United States. The hysteria is based on fear -- fear of Russia, fear of revolution, fear of change, fear of being called a Communist."
> Therefore, the book is called The Fear of Freedom.

The significance of Mr. Biddle's book lies in the fact that it was written and published. This is another evidence of fear spreading among the advocates of collectivized "freedom". For the past ten years, as the blurb on the jacket inadvertently admits, more and more Americans have been suspecting that what the intellectuals have been peddling as "freedom" is a fake. This suspicion is finding increased expression, though it is still not very loud, and the intellectuals are worried. During the preceding decade, thanks to the blessing and patronage of their reigning prince, they had built up a solid monopoly of thought, through control of the schools, press and book-publishing business. A dissident voice had no way of expressing itself. Upon the death of their patron and the end of the war, querulous words began to be heard. Somebody dared to make a speech in which he raised doubt as to the quality of the "freedom" the intellectuals were selling; little publications began exposing the fraud, and an intrepid publisher or two ventured a revisionist book. Even Congressmen took notice.

There is nothing a monopolist fears as much as competition. Hence, the heretofore solidly entrenched lovers of "freedom", Socialist style, are rising to the challenge, using either the weapons of invective -- fascist, reactionary, etc. -- to scare off their opponents, or calling upon the gods of "academic freedom" or "constitutional rights" (the very same rights which they flout) to bear witness to their purity of soul and their honesty of purpose.

To be sure, Mr. Biddle is right in saying that America is now on one of its periodic witch-hunts. When dupes realize that the cure-all they have paid good money for is nothing but a habit-forming narcotic, they are likely to vent their vengeance in unmannerly and excessive ways. They charge like maddened bulls on all and sundry. The real danger in the indeterminate anti-Communist legislation is that in the enforcement of these laws the advocates of true freedom -- those who are for the abolition of political interventions -- might be tarred with the same stick. But, the bottom cause of such legislation, of the national witch-hunt, is the fraud perpetrated by the medicine men who are now protesting their righteous indignation. The conflagration they started will not be quenched with pious books.

So perverse is the logic of the Biddles that even as they cry out against the "fear of freedom" they persist in advertising their brand as the real thing, and this despite the rising resentment against it. They still talk of freedom as political control, with themselves, of course, in control; and democracy they equate with egalitarianism, effected by confiscation under their guidance. The semantics by which they have been traducing their victims have warped their own minds. So much so that they cannot recognize, in the face of mounting evidence, the fact that a Communist plot, hatched in the heyday of their monopoly, is at work to undermine what we have left of real freedom.

The introduction to Mr. Biddle's book needs mentioning. It was authored by Harold L. Ickes. "Honest" Harold shows that he has not lost his skill at invective, nor his penchant for distorting facts.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

European Supplement *to* Human Events Vol. VIII, No. 52

By BERTRAND DE JOUVENEL London — December, 1951

Report on Britain: Writing this time from England, I shall attempt an estimate of what can be expected from her change of government. The attempt should be prefaced by an explanation of the British political system.

When a party wins the election, it installs itself simultaneously in Whitehall and in Westminster, running both the Administration and Parliament. The captain of the team allots Cabinet positions to major lieutenants, lesser ministerial offices to minor lieutenants. As many as fifty members combine administrative responsibilities with legislative powers. Other members of the winning party are mere "back-benchers"; they sit (many stand when the house is crowded) behind their ministers who, from the Front Bench, put forward the measures decided upon by the Cabinet. There are no positions of power and dignity to be attained in Parliament, such as Congressional committee chairmanships. The ambition of a back-bencher is to be picked by his Prime Minister for some ministerial office. The Parliamentary majority consists of the rank and file of the Administration, and Parliament has no independent existence; it is controlled by the Administration.

Such is the British system. It is apparent that without any "checks and balances" to hamper it, the Conservative government is in position to reverse the policies of the Labor government. This, however, it will not do. Why? To this query responsible Conservatives answer: "It can't be done." But again, why? I offer the answers given me.

* * *

The Case of Irreversibility: First, some Socialistic measures, it is maintained, are prescribed by the national situation, and must be continued until the situation changes. Thus, the Conservative government has called for extension of the legal powers to enforce consumption controls, allocations of materials, regulation of prices; the new Chancellor announced, evoking Labor laughter, a reduction in tourist allowances from 100 pounds to 50.

Again, even though the Conservatives had attacked the Labor government for its lack of cooperation with Continental Europe, upon coming into power they proceeded to put further limitations on trade, particularly with Europe. Lord Woolton, badly teased for his election promises of better food and more meat, answered with a 25 per cent cut in the imports of unrationed meats. "Austerity" reached a high point with the allocation of one bag of coal per household per week. When the Socialists compare these constrictions with their own, which the Conservatives criticized so severely, the answer is that "circumstances" command.

Secondly, the Conservatives say that the characteristically socialistic nationalizations are beyond recall, that "unscrambling" is not feasible. It will be difficult enough, they say, in the case of steel where nationalization had hardly come into being. In other cases, even structural reforms are "wisely put off", as the liberal *Manchester Guardian* expresses it.

Thirdly, the Conservatives say they must move gingerly if at all in the "highly charged realm" of "welfare" measures. *The Economist*, speaking of food subsidies and rent controls, urges that "this enormous lump of rigid artificiality" should not remain "permanently imbedded in the economy". The practical politicians, however, feel that any abandonment of subsidies will dangerously quicken wage demands. They are worried enough as it is, for the national wage bill has risen more sharply in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

1951 than in any preceding peace year, and they know they will get less cooperation from the unions than did the Labor government.

The decision to charge local authorities higher interest rates for housing loans will be followed by a subsidy; for the increase in interest rates will raise the rents of Council houses by 70 cents a week, a politically dangerous bomb that must be doused with subventions. It is agreed by all that personal consumption must be cut down — as the former Chancellor repeatedly said. As for eliminating subsidized social service, the Conservatives are chary of going beyond the program of the former government, which, *The Banker* states, was "permitting some very significant, though concealed, cutting for the last two years".

* * *

Irreversibility Explained: National circumstances, technical difficulties, psychological obstacles, are the given reasons. But deeper reasons should be brought to light. English history offers but one instance of outright "reaction" and that an unsuccessful one: the Stuart restoration. It is therefore a profound Tory belief that the function of Conservatism is not to restore a national framework which has suffered change, but to make adjustments within the altered framework. Indeed, British Tories point to France as instancing the futility of attempts to "go back". The political ineffectiveness of the French Right for a hundred years, they declare, was due to its efforts to restore a former condition; when it did succeed in so doing, it only prepared the way for another violent upheaval.

To the British Tory the first principle is holding the nation together. They regard it as silly to undo by virtue of their present majority what the Labor people would be sure to restore in a more passionate mood when their time comes again.

Moreover, the Conservatives are not unsympathetic to the ethics of the Socialist party. Foreigners are apt to overlook that. After all, the crushing load of progressive taxation was brought about by Churchill during the War; so, too, was the principle of equal shares now ingrained in British psychology. Again, the groundwork for the Beveridgian scheme of comprehensive Social Security was prepared by the National Government. Mr. Harold McMillan, a major figure in the present Cabinet, was quite active in PEP — the Political and Economic Planning organization, founded before the war.

To be sure, the brutal egalitarian measures instituted under Churchill were supported by war conditions; the will to resist, the spirit of national unity, would be strengthened by improvement of the status of those who had least to defend, it was argued. A distinguished Socialist economist, Professor Arthur Lewis, pointed out to me that "leveling" was not essentially a Socialist but rather a war-time achievement. Many now feel that, with restoration of peace conditions, the more capable should find it possible to better themselves: but not at the expense of those who have acquired a vested right in their favored position. Self-improvement, they maintain, must come from a general increase in wealth. But a general increase is hardly possible under present institutions. And there we have a deadlock.

* * *

The Reading of the National Situation: England is the only Western country which gives the impression of still being at war. Personal sacrifices are accepted in a spirit of patriotism, ungrumblingly; during a three-weeks' stay, I was often asked whether I was not too cold, though nobody mentioned the bag of coal per household per week. It is felt that the country is under siege, and that the difficulties must be endured with good will.

Is the siege inevitable? Both parties seem to regard it as a historic necessity. *The Banker* notes: "Mr. Butler's diagnosis of the basic cause of Britain's disequilibrium differed hardly at all from Mr. Gaitskell's, except that it took a somewhat graver view of Britain's plight." Perhaps this similar reading of history is due in some degree to the use of the same advisers. As Mr. Attlee said to Mr.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Churchill in the military debate: "We acted upon very good military advice. I expect it is the same advice as the Right Honorable gentleman is acting upon now." (Laughter.) This is not true only of the military; the guiding hand and chiding voice of a continuing Civil Service is omnipresent.

What is the logic behind this agreement between Conservatives and Laborites? The population of the U.K. has multiplied four-fold in 150 years, and has become increasingly dependent upon imported food. This has to be paid for by the export of manufactures, which in turn calls for the import of raw materials. Thus England's life literally depends upon her selling enough industrial products to pay for the necessary imports of food and raw materials. This was no difficulty so long as England was the world's main industrial exporter, a position she has lost. The problem of balance is made more acute by the rise in prices of raw materials as against what she can get for manufactures.

Therefore, both Chancellors argue, there must be restrictions on imports and on expenditures abroad, channeling of raw material into the most essential uses, and a general husbanding of consumption.

This is the British paradox: because England is impoverished, "fair shares" appear to be necessary; but does not the sharing impair the national capacity to improve the economy? To lift the siege? Does it not lead to waste? For instance, does not the enormous taxation of corporations lead to a wasteful increase of overhead expenditures? Harold Wincott makes the point that the director of a company may install an untaxed television set in the Boardroom while a set in his home might cost him forty times as much, thanks to taxes.

Though this is an amusing and not unimportant point, a far more telling one can be made of the case of the worker who, unable to get the things he wants, has no incentive to increase his output. His food costs are low but because the food is not abundantly obtainable, the low prices are meaningless; and the tendency is to direct his buying power toward non-essentials, the production of which is thereby stimulated.

Both parties take a pride in the cheapness of food, when available. According to *The Economist*, the cost of rations per week per head is as low as £1.22 to the consumer (the Government assuming in subsidies a further expenditure of £.44). The weekly average of consumer expenditure on food (including the unrationed) is only £2.26 per head (subsidies included: £2.70). A surprising achievement! It is something of a paradox that the country most lacking in food should thus be the one where food is cheapest (cheaper by 60 per cent than in France, at prevailing rates of exchange). Instead of being expensive because it is scarce, food is cheap because it is necessary! A philosopher would say that the principle of causality is not allowed to work and that finality is made to prevail.

It is to me remarkable how far English minds and *mores* are adapted to what one might call Socialistic finality. Perhaps Marx was right when he predicted that England would be the first Socialist country. It is certainly the first where Socialism has imbedded itself in the minds of the great majority.

* * *

An Orthodox Policy: Let me not imply that the Conservatives are changing nothing. Up to now "the one bold and imaginative initiative that Mr. Butler has taken has been to enlist the aid of orthodox monetary weapons". Thus *The Banker*. It was agreed by all experts on both sides of the political fence, that a major influence in checking exports, to pay for vital imports, is internal inflationary pressure; rising prices would make Britain's goods unattractive to foreigners. The previous government looked to taxation to sponge up this excessive buying power. The new Chancellor chose another policy. He raised the Bank rate of interest by a one-half per cent, and instituted a few other unpretentious measures calculated to cause monetary stringency.

The treasury caused the banks to exchange huge holdings of Treasury bills for Funded Stock, thus decreasing their liquidity, while on the other hand the "pegging" of Government bonds by indirect action

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the Bank of England was discontinued (a decision which must call to the mind of the American reader the heated discussion about the same policy between the American Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board at the end of last year). The result of these measures, combined with repeated warnings that the rate of interest may go higher, has worked like magic to restrain banks from granting further credit advances, or from renewing them freely.

Thus business will find the going more difficult at a time when wages are still advancing. These are conditions under which some unemployment must arise. But the Government financial experts deem this necessary in order to move manpower towards rearmament industries (or export activities).

Political experts nod their heads warningly and say that the coming of unemployment, however easily remedied by the opening of new jobs, must hurt Conservative prospects in the next election. But one minister in conversation with me reported: "Winning the next election is not what we are after. We are trying to keep the country a going concern."

* * *

Britain and Europe: It would be too much to say that the new government's attitude toward Europe has been a disappointment. It would have been if the hopes of British leadership in European organizations, lighted up by Mr. Churchill in his Zurich speech and in the Hague Conference, had still been aflame. But these hopes have long died out. When a friendly English publication asked me, before the election, to write about French expectations, linked to the prospective change of government, I had to report that French expectations were nil. Everybody in France felt that whatever the outcome we would have in England a reliable friend, but not a partner in the construction of Europe. In the course of my last visit I found practically all my interlocutors, when put on the theme of Europe, congratulating themselves on having kept out of the Schuman plan and the European Army, "subjects upon which you yourselves seem to have second thoughts".

Those who listened as the returns of the last election gradually came in, were struck by the recurrence of the expression "No Change". (It was indeed an election in which less than five per cent of the members were unseated.) The expression of "No change" does not seem to sum up to a large degree the impression I brought back from my stay. I call to mind a page of that great scholar Sumner Maine. He describes how, in a society which has conservative virtues, the new can come to be cherished and respected immediately as "ancient" and immovable. Perhaps this is relevant.

This report on England by M. de Jouvenel drives home a lesson of importance to Americans: that Socialism is nothing that can be put on or taken off, but is rather a disease that penetrates the very marrow of the nation that tries it. That is because Socialism is essentially a scheme to create new vested interests, which a change of regime cannot dislodge. Thus, public housing creates a vested interest in subsidized rent, and the votes of the subsidized tenants count as much as those who pay both their own rents and those of the privileged class; and bankers and mortgagees whose investment in public housing is guaranteed by the government are equally indisposed to abandon the scheme. . . . . Under the circumstances the prospect for England is not only a continuation of the Socialism that has been installed, but an aggravated condition. Since, as M. de Jouvenel indicates, the productive capacity of the country has been impaired, it is reasonable to predict that this disease will ultimately ruin the British economy. This seems to be the only way to get rid of Socialism, once it has got hold of a country. . . . There is no compromise with Socialism. It must be fought at every step. There is still a chance that America can prevent this disease from destroying our economy, but it will not be done by appeasement. And, it will not be prevented by partisan politics.—Editors.

Copyright 1951 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED